



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,613	03/17/2006	Donato Pasquariello	NL 041035	7658
24737 7590 07/24/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
LAM, VINH TANG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/572,613

Applicant(s)

PASQUARIELLO ET AL.

Examiner

VINH T. LAM

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/23/2007
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims **1, 9, 12, and 13-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Tanaka (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0050670)**.

Regarding Claim **1**, **Tanaka** teaches a device comprising: light detector means for detecting light and in response generating detection information (Col. **2**, **[0045]**, FIG. **2**); a light-guiding layer comprising an outer side for guiding incident light arriving at the outer side (Col. **2**, **[0047]**, FIG. **2**); and originating from an input device (Col. **2**, **[0043]**, FIG. **2**); towards the light detector means (Col. **2**, **[0045]**, FIG. **2**); and a converter for converting the detection information into further information (Col. **2**, **[0045]**, FIG. **2**) for taking into account an angle between the incident light and a predetermined direction relative to the light-guiding layer (Col. **3**, **[0066]**, FIG. **2**).

Regarding Claim **9**, **Tanaka** teaches the device of claim 1, further comprising a display monitor (Col. **2**, **[0043]**, FIG. **2**), and wherein the light-guiding layer comprises an inner side for guiding light arriving at the inner side and originating from the display monitor to the outer side (Col. **3**, **[0047]**, FIG. **2**).

Regarding Claim **12**, the device of claim 1, further comprising a selector for, in response to the further information; selecting a user from a plurality of users each one operating his/her own input device which is obviously **well-known** in input/coordinates and gaming devices where users have options to select personal and preferred settings.

Regarding Claims **13 to 16**, they are rejected by the same rationales as that of Claim 1 since they are a display monitor, an extension, a method, and a processor program product that perform functions achieving the identical results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **2-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0050670)** in view of **Van Delden et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2006/0279558)**.

Regarding Claim **2**, **Tanaka** teaches the device of claim 1 and the light detector means comprises the first and second detector.

However, **Tanaka** does not teach the locations of the detectors relative to the light-guiding layer.

In the same field of endeavor, **Van Delden et al.** teach the light detector means comprises a X detector at a X side of the light-guiding layer for generating a first

detection signal x (Col. 3, [0042] & [0044], FIG. 2). It is obvious a Designer Choice to place a second detector (additional X- detector) at a second side of the light-guiding layer for generating a second detection signal x and wherein the first and second sides are opposite sides of the layer for the benefit of a light detecting device alternatively detecting the X coordinates of the input signal.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to unite **Tanaka** teaching of a light detecting device to **Van Delden et al.** teaching of detecting the X coordinates of the input signal in order to benefit of a light detecting device alternatively detecting the X coordinates of the input signal.

Regarding Claim 3, the device of claim 2 wherein **Van Delden et al.** teach the light detectors further comprising a detector at a side of the light-guiding layer for generating a detection signal y (Col. 2, [0042] & [0044], FIG. 2).

Regarding Claim 4, the device of claim 3 wherein **Tanaka** further teaches the information comprising at least one of coordinates of a location of incidence x, y, wherein x is a function of X_a , X_b , and y (Col. 3, [0066], FIG. 4).

Regarding Claim 5, the device of claim 3 wherein **Tanaka** further teaches the information comprising an angle of incidence that depends linearly on α wherein $\tan \alpha$ is a function of X_a , X_b , and y (Col. 3, [0066], FIG. 4) where the calculation of involving X-Y coordinates, trigonometry, and optics are well-known in the academic institutions.

Regarding Claim 6, the device of claim 2 wherein **Tanaka** teaches the third and fourth detectors Y_a and Y_b (Col. 3, [0066], FIG. 4).

However, **Tanaka** does not teach the locations of the detectors relative to the light-guiding layer.

In the same field of endeavor, **Van Delden et al.** teach the light detectors comprise a Y detector at a Y side of the light-guiding layer for generating a detection signal y (Col. 3, [0042] & [0044], FIG. 2). It is obvious a Designer Choice to place a second Y-detector at a second Y side of the light-guiding layer for generating a second detection signal y and wherein the first and second Y sides are opposite sides of the layer for the benefit of a light detecting device alternatively detecting the Y coordinates of the input signal.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to unite **Tanaka** teaching of a light detecting device to **Van Delden et al.** teaching of detecting the Y coordinates of the input signal in order to benefit of a light detecting device alternatively detecting the Y coordinates of the input signal.

Regarding Claim 7, the device of claim 6 wherein **Tanaka** further teaches the information comprises at least one of coordinates of a location of incidence x, y, wherein x and y are functions of X_a , X_b , Y_a , and Y_b (Col. 3, [0066], FIG. 4).

Regarding Claim 8, **Van Delden et al.** teach the device of claim 6, wherein the further information comprises at least one of a first angle of incidence and a second angle of incidence, the first angle of incidence depending linearly on α and the second angle of incidence depending linearly on β , wherein $\tan \alpha$ and $\tan \beta$ are functions of X_a , X_b , Y_a , and Y_b (Col. 3, [0066], FIG. 4) where the calculation of involving X-Y coordinates, trigonometry, and optics are well-known in the academic institutions.

3. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0050670)** in view of **Kawakami et al. (US Patent No. 6614436)**.

Regarding Claim 10, **Tanaka** teaches the device of claim 1.

However, **Tanaka** does not teach an adapter for, in response to the further information, adapting a device parameter.

In the same field of endeavor, **Kawakami et al.** teach an adapter for, in response to the further information, adapting a device parameter (Col. 15, Ln. 37-45, FIG. 22) for the benefit of having a light detector device with an adapter to adjust video and audio parameters.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to unite **Tanaka** teaching of a light detecting device to **Kawakami et al.** teaching of an adapter in order to benefit of having a light detector device with an adapter to adjust video and audio parameters.

Regarding Claim 11, **Kawakami et al.** teach the device of claim 10, wherein the device parameter comprises at least one of: a rotation parameter defining a rotation of a 3D object displayed on a display monitor (2); a zooming parameter; a scrolling parameter; a sound volume parameter; an image contrast parameter; an image brightness parameter; a sound optimizing parameter (Col. 15, Ln. 37-45, FIG. 22).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is: Kobayashi (US Patent Publication Application 2002/0067341).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VINH T. LAM whose telephone number is (571)270-3704. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-5:00) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571 272 1206. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VTL/

/Amare Mengistu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629